## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/786,863	GROENENDAAL ET AL.	
Examiner	A 1 1 ! 4	
LAGIIIIICI	Art Unit	

		WHOTH REET THAT	2107	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	•
THE F	REPLY FILED <u>17 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION I	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Continued Examination (RCE)	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which p with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a I	laces the Request
a)	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	= -		
b) [	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	g date of the final rejection.	
have b under set fort may re	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( ions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date een filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) CE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply original three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropriate exte inally set in the final Office action	nsion fee n; or (2) as
	 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the	e date of
•	filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extensions of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w IDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of the appea	
	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I			
	(a) 🔀 They raise new issues that would require further co	•	TE below);	
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•		
1	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying the issu	es for
	appeal; and/or (d) ☑ They present additional claims without canceling a o	corresponding number of finally re	ected claims	
	NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		Color diamio.	
4. □	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	omnliant Amendment (PTOL-	324)
5. <b> </b>	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mphane / menament (1 102 )	OZ-+ ).
6.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendment canc	eling the
_	non-allowable claim(s).	iowabie ii oabiiilloa iii a ooparate,	timely med amenament same	omig alo
7. 🛛	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .		ill be entered and an explanat	tion of
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .			
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <i>none</i> . DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
:	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to obshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails to pro ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	n of the status of the claims after $\epsilon$	ntry is below or attached.	
	JEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowance bec	ause:
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/ lob	n R. Cottingham/			
	n R. Cottingham/ ervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claims 21-23 are new and therefore require further consideration and/or search..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 11/17/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's primarily assert the following:

A. Applicant's assert that a relational mapper embodied in a machine-readable medium and operable to translate the relational query received through the relational interface from the software application, to native protocol messages according to an access protocol associated with the network device is not disclosed. In particular applicant's assert that there to translate the relational query received through the relational interface from the software application, to native protocol messages according to an access protocol associated with the network device is not disclosed.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's appear to mainly assert that the limitation is not taught because a translation does not occur. Col. 6 lines 54-58 discloses the database manages data tables that store information sets that define what needs to be collected from devices in the network 108, and the information needed by the collection engine 20 to interpret the information collected from the network 108. Further disclosing col. 7 lines 24-26, the collection engine using a function call that requests the collection engine using a function call that requests the collection engine to collect data from a particular network device. Accordingly, the collection engine interprets the request. Applicant's further assert that there is no native protocol according to an access protocol, and therefore the limitation is not disclosed. Col. 7 lines 30-32, in response to the collection request the collection engine enters state 2, in which it sends an SNMP message over the network to the network device. Accordingly, to a native protocol messages (SNMP messages queries) according to an access protocol (SNMP, col. 1 line 26).

In regards to the limitation, a relational mapper embodied in a machine-readable medium (figure 1 element 102, network management server) and operable to translate (figure 2 states 1-3; col. 6 lines 54-58, interprets) the relational query (col. 7 lines 27-28, collection request) received through the relational interface (figure 1 element 102, network management server) from the software application (col. 7 line 24, application program), to native protocol messages (col. 7 lines 30-32, SNMP message queries) according to an access protocol (SNMP, simple network management protocol, col. 1 line 26) associated with the network device (figure 1 element 118).

The claims are therefore deemed broad enough to be disclosed by the cited reference. The rejection is therefore maintained.